United Nations DP/2011/7

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund

Distr.: General
29 December 2010

Original: English

First regular session 2011
31 January to 3 February 2011, New York
Item 4 of the provisional agenda
Evaluation

Management response to the evaluation of UNDP contribution to strengthening national capacities

Context, background and findings

1. Developing the capacity of institutions and individuals is the foundation of resilience, national ownership and sustainability of results. Evidence from the field shows that progress on capacity development can be an important accelerator of progress on the Millennium Development Goals. UNDP invests in national capacities because it believes that systems, institutions and individuals with capacity provide the flexibility that countries need to consolidate development results. This enables development learning as well as formulation of exit strategies for development partners and leads to the transformative results that UNDP seeks to achieve. Capacity development is a major component of UNDP programmes and focus areas that support the values and objectives of the Millennium Declaration: poverty eradication and internationally agreed development goals; democratic governance; crisis prevention and recovery; and environment and energy.

2. Partner countries continue to request support from UNDP to develop the capacities of national and sub-national institutions. This support is used to assess capacities and constraints, to cost capacity investments and to support implementation of programmes that develop capacity. Countries also ask for information about successful approaches from other countries in both the South and the North. Partner country requests have been underscored in successive resolutions of the triennial comprehensive policy reviews (TCPRs). The UNDP strategic plan for 2008-2013 confirms, more explicitly and extensively than earlier frameworks, that capacity development is the central feature of UNDP support through its main thematic areas. It informs the organization's work at the country level as a distinct agency and as part of United Nations country teams (UNCTs).

3. The evaluation of UNDP contribution to strengthening national capacities adopts a country-led inductive method of enquiry that UNDP welcomes. It finds that UNDP's signal achievement in responding to national demand and recent TCPRs has been the "level of sustained investment and attention [that is] unique among the United Nations agencies" (paragraph 6). The evaluation also draws attention to the fact that capacity development is, for all its importance, ultimately just a means to the end. It invites UNDP to consider ways

10-71088 (E) 250111

to improve the internal organization of its response at the country level, which may also facilitate better external communication and reporting of its contributions.

4. By making the implementation of UNDP's commitment to capacity development at the country level its core feature, the evaluation provides useful insights into ongoing efforts to strengthen UNDP's approaches. This management response, therefore, emphasizes implementation-related issues, with an explicit focus on improvements at the country level. The response will take into account UNDP's specific role and also its special role within the United Nations development system and the wider international development community.

5. The management response is organized into two parts. First is the response to a selection of issues that UNDP believes would benefit from further discussion with the Executive Board. Second is a matrix of recommendations and management actions for discussion.

Response to national demand

6. UNDP partially agrees with the evaluation's observation that UNDP has not fully made the shift to nationally led change (paragraphs 25-26). UNDP's capacity development approach is based on its commitment to align to nationally led processes. For instance, in the late 1990s UNDP was invited by partner governments to respond to the emergence of poverty reduction strategy papers. It did so in three ways: (1) by helping convene and/or moderate dialogue; (2) by helping to develop capacity for broad-based engagement, including from civil society; and (3) by facilitating the provision of impartial analytical inputs, typically informed by the partner country's emerging national priorities or commitments to international development targets, including the Millennium Development Goals.

7. As the evaluation observes, UNDP has been "highly responsive" to national demand in this respect (paragraph 25). From less than 5 country offices in 2000 to more than 80 in 2004, this was a dramatic response to national demand that in many cases matured into opportunities for longer-term capacity development support to institutionalize inclusive dialogue on poverty reduction. This is an example of immediate national demand evolving into different and sometimes unanticipated forms of engagement as relationships and needs evolved. Similarly, support to the formulation of national human development reports helped open opportunities to broaden participation in policy development in a number of countries. It also left behind real capacity: 140 countries now produce their own national human development reports.

8. As demand has evolved during UNDP's long-term association with its national counterparts, so has the organization's investment, such as through the encouragement of catalytic capacity development ventures as part of the allocation of TRAC[1] 1.2. UNDP is currently engaged in building capacity in the health ministries/systems of 26 countries where UNDP still acts as the principal recipient of resources from the Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, so that these functions can be transferred in a responsible manner to national ministries. As demand continues to grow and diversify based on country realities, the challenge facing UNDP is similar to that facing all international development partners: how to respond to national preferences and approaches effectively without resorting to the standardized (and standardizing) tendencies of the 'planned' approach to development. The evaluation correctly points to the non-linear nature of endogenous processes and the fact that traction often depends on many factors, not all of which can be planned.

[1] Target for resource assignment from the core.

9. Beyond the technical aspects of UNDP's response, the evaluation makes a crucial observation that helps to characterize the reality of engagement between national counterparts and UNDP. It correctly finds that country circumstances:

"...play a major role in determining opportunities for UNDP to engage governments in capacity development. These circumstances include the commitment and degree of cooperation within the government; UNDP's relationships with the units that drive government-wide reforms; and the degree to which UNDP's established national partners see capacity development as part of their responsibilities. This is the essential dialogue for transformation that UNDP aims to undertake. Also important is the degree to which governments are willing to engage with UNDP and whether they think that UNDP has something to offer" (paragraph 14).

10. This observation demonstrates that assets such as trust, longevity, competence and access to knowledge are key to overcoming, in the medium to long term, some of the unpredictability that is a normal part of partnerships in the short term. It also draws attention to the fact that responding to national demand does not always promise time-bound returns, and that results cannot be expected to fit conveniently within a calendar of intended outcomes.

11. Because of this, UNDP recognizes that the rapidly changing nature and composition of national demand calls for analytical ability, operational flexibility and a continuously refined approach to results management to which its current staff resources, modalities, guidance and metrics are still adapting. This realization lies behind efforts now under way to improve the application of knowledge across the organization, advance the discussion on results metrics and assess and update how UNDP approaches programme and project management at country level. The need to focus on systemic capacity development challenges rather than the immediate and ad hoc concerns at project levels also calls for a more basic shift, focusing on incentives, so that capacity investments concentrate on the medium- to long-term challenges and not merely the short-term.

Learning from experience

12. UNDP's engagement with endogenous planning and strategy making with respect to capacity development has been supported by two high-level global events that provided the opportunity to learn from national experiences, in 2006 in Madrid and in 2010 in Marrakech. Similar efforts have been made at the regional level. Since 2007, the regional service centre in the Asia and Pacific region has held annual capacity development learning weeks for national government representatives, which have generated considerable demand. These events have had three major accomplishments: (1) engagement with high-level functionaries from the government on forging a common understanding of capacity challenges, including on why investment in capacity development is a national imperative; (2) peer-to-peer sharing of experiences on policy choices that have affected capacity development and success stories as viewed from the national perspective; and (3) a wider understanding of what UNDP has to offer in support of capacity development.

13. In Africa, the regional bureau is supporting an initiative to mainstream capacity development into the national planning systems in 16 countries. It also aims to generate locally adapted national capacity development strategies linked to national planning cycles. In Latin America, the regional South-South Cooperation platform is being supported, and a diploma course for civil servants on capacity development is being tested. In the Europe and Central Asia region, national capacity development facilities have been tested successfully and capacity development support is being sought for EU accession eligibility by a number of countries (paragraphs 111, 112 and box 9). In the Arab States region,

UNDP has engaged with centre of government institutions in the Occupied Palestinian Territories and provided direct institutional strengthening support to the Prime Minister's office, General Personnel Council (equivalent of the civil service recruiting body and training body) and Ministries of Planning and Social Welfare. These have involved assessing baseline capacity assets and then developing comprehensive capacity development plans ranging from the short term to the longer term. These illustrations demonstrate how UNDP supports centre of government institutions to be sustainable and to carry on their functions without UNDP support.

14. As shown above, UNDP has invested heavily in capturing and disseminating country practices both globally and regionally. The evaluation notes, "There is good internal guidance reflecting what effective capacity development is and there is international recognition of UNDP's work" (paragraph 21). However, the evaluation goes on to raise important observations about aspects of organizational learning. It notes that "UNDP has not sufficiently analyzed examples of good capacity development practice at regional and country levels or their implications for replication" (paragraph 19) and that UNDP's attempts to codify its learning sometimes has limited value to partner countries. This point is made with specific reference to guidance. The evaluation finds that guidance prepared by UNDP has been hard to understand, which leads to the impression that it is supply driven rather than a distillation of good country practices. These are important points about country utility, and they warrant reflection.

15. UNDP has made significant efforts to enhance critical reflection, organizational learning and sharing of experiences between partners. Historically and in collaboration with partner counterparts in the North and the South, UNDP has made significant contributions to literature capturing experiences of capacity development, as well as the larger discourse on the subject. The creation of a more robust knowledge platform, and its growing usage, will make this knowledge more accessible to a wider audience. The capture of stories and analysis of good experience has been significantly strengthened, and further work is under way.[2]

16. To connect such experiences around the globe, UNDP now manages a multi-donor funded programme to support the Learning Network on Capacity Development (LenCD), which aims, inter alia, to strengthen peer learning through South-South cooperation. UNDP is also strengthening its in-house capture of knowledge, which it will soon make available to all countries through its knowledge platform. Having such external and internal linkages of experiences puts UNDP in a position to facilitate programme countries to prepare positions on capacity development for such opportunities as the 2011 High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in the Republic of Korea.

17. These convening and connecting activities have demonstrated steady results over the years. UNDP was one of the facilitators of the process that led to the signing of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. This process was further enriched for the Accra Agenda for Action, which expanded the dialogue and consensus-building process to include a wider number of partners from the South as well as non-state actors. Early impressions suggest an unprecedented level of participation by partners of the South in preparatory activities leading up to the forum in the Republic of Korea. Networks like LenCD provide a platform for exchange among diverse partners of the North and the South, and they showcase evolving thinking on policy and practice of capacity development as they emerge in different agencies and governments.

[2] Information can be found at www.undp.org/capacity and www.capacityisdevelopment.org.

Exit strategies

18. The evaluation found that, ". the design of its projects shows limited evidence of UNDP efforts to apply the principles of effective capacity" and that, "In general, there were no well-defined or appropriate exit strategies. UNDP projects and programmes remain narrowly focused in terms of the types of capacity they seek to develop" (paragraph 16). This finding warrants special attention. There are at least two elements to the issue that may be considered.

19. First, systemic and institutional capacities take time to show results. In certain countries, for instance, the disinvestment in physical infrastructure or human resource capacities over the course of decades is reflected in the composition of short- to medium-term projects. Such projects heavily feature physical and human resource inputs. That is to say, short- to medium-term projects are designed to compensate for long-term disinvestments. Under such circumstances, it comes as no surprise that the evaluation observes the majority of UNDP capacity development results are related to implementation of operational strategies, interventions at sub-national level and aid effectiveness. To these UNDP adds conflict prevention and disaster preparedness, or resilience to shocks.

20. Though important, these interventions do not address the systemic challenges to which the evaluation correctly alludes. Not only is this approach uneconomical, UNDP agrees that it is unsustainable as well. However, the challenge of 'exiting' from projects is not project-specific or limited to UNDP, it is a systemic challenge associated with the long-term trends and nature of development cooperation in particular circumstances. Nevertheless, UNDP is examining this issue as part of its review of programme and project management, both in light of its own experiences and based on the evolving practices of other development partners at the country level.

21. Second, the evaluation assumes that exiting a sector, or even a country, is the normal course of action where sufficient capacities exist. In other words, successful capacity development is interpreted to be the best exit strategy. There is a definite appeal to this idea, since it implies self-sufficiency and accomplishment for the stakeholders of an initiative. Nevertheless, this perspective assumes that development has an end point. The reality, or realities, is that partner country demands continue to evolve based on a host of factors. We accept, as the evaluation infers, that development is not a linear experience and that both within and between countries variations occur that require different types of engagement. Rather than a relationship based on a planned 'exit', UNDP's experience with partner countries is one of evolution, in which the consolidation and learning from results in one area lead to adjustments and/or engagement in another. UNDP strives to maintain a flexible profile suited to the demands of countries occupying different spaces on the development map and to strengthen the organization's own capacity to respond effectively and with relevance to varied national demand.

Country-facing capacity development

22. As referred to earlier in this response, paragraph 27 of the evaluation highlights the limitations of the "planned" approach to development cooperation. It does so in challenging UNDP to do more "to better position itself and strategically address its mandate for capacity development." UNDP is committed to addressing this suggestion through a three-part intervention. It is important to note that some work is already under way in all of these realms. The commitment here is to broaden and fast track this work.

23. In the first part, UNDP will work within existing legal and financial frameworks and the principles of system-wide coherence to improve its approach to programme and project management. A time-bound exercise has already been initiated in this regard. This is partly

based on the recognition that the instrumentation and procedures of programming and project management themselves can inhibit the realization of strategic positioning, particularly as the modalities promoted by traditional donors have evolved over the last decade.

24. Modest but important adjustments have already been taken to ensure better alignment of UNDP and UNCT programming approaches with country circumstances. Such flexibility, which can now be exercised voluntarily by partner countries and UNCTs, means that UNCTs can match the typically strong substantive alignment of their support to national development objectives with equally strong alignment to national institutional and procedural arrangements. UNDP will further strengthen its internal guidance and procedures to ensure that institutional transformation and strengthening of capacities is particularly highlighted as an outcome of UNDP's interventions. Implementation of projects and programmes should consciously build in such considerations. UNDP strongly advocated for these adjustments in time for formulation of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), as well as related country programme documents, that will define UNCT/UNDP cooperation between now and 2015. The organization views this as a partial but important step in better positioning its own country offices, and UNCTs, to engage in strategic capacity development issues.

25. The second part of this three-part agenda is the capacity development learning agenda. Some work remains to be done in sharing with partner governments UNDP's understanding of capacity development as a critical component of leveraging sustainable change. A corollary of this is the understanding of capacity development as a transformative process by all UNDP staff and managers, particularly at the country level, along with the ability to identify the opportunities for such transformative action. UNDP takes this suggestion of the evaluation seriously and commits to work with country office staff and managers to enhance the understanding of the opportunities for and application of capacity development as a transformative intervention. To this end, existing guidance will be reviewed and made more explicit.

26. The third and final part is the capture and communication of results. The current results management system is increasingly effective in capturing programmatic outcomes. This needs to be complemented by capturing and communicating UNDP's contributions to outcomes in terms of institutional transformation, or demonstrated improvements in human resources capacities.

Capacity development in the United Nations Development Group

27. UNDP has facilitated a common approach to capacity development in the United Nations Development Group, and a new policy was issued in 2006. Following this contribution, capacity development was included as one of five programming principles in the revised UNDAF guidance of 2007. UNDP recognizes that, as stated in successive TCPR resolutions, capacity development is the common denominator enabling UNCTs to achieve system-wide coherence through the substance of their work, and while responding to national demand. UNDP's own capacity development advisors will more proactively promote substantive coherence in United Nations responses aligned to national priorities. Such direct engagement by capacity development advisors in the programme and project cycle can help address another concern expressed by the evaluation: that "UNDP is missing opportunities at programme and project levels to identify and highlight government opportunities to meet both immediate demands and medium- or longer term capacity development needs" (paragraph 27). In its convening role of the UNCT and in its own specialized role as the capacity development agency of the United Nations, UNDP will

view through the lens of capacity development the three work streams highlighted above: programming, learning and results.

28. UNDP welcomes the evaluation findings and the challenges it highlights. They provide a timely basis for dialogue with the Executive Board on the future directions of this central feature of UNDP support at the country level. To that end, the matrix that follows lays out the main recommendations, together with specific management responses and action points.

Annex. Key recommendations and management response

Evaluation recommendation 1. UNDP should prioritize implementation of the principles embedded in the strategic plan across all countries.

UNDP should build on its analytical work and successful programmatic experience to shift to an approach fully led by national governments that responds to immediate government needs while maximizing the contribution to capacity development. At the operational level, implementation of the principles for managing the relationship between UNDP and national partners is the most important priority, rather than further refinement of tools and guidance. This requires ensuring that governments and other national partners are aware of and buy in to the proposed changes in the nature of the relationship with UNDP. It also requires ensuring that partners are aware of what expertise on capacity development they may access through UNDP. Internally, this approach requires UNDP to highlight the importance of implementing the principles (of capacity development) and identifying how to better support their implementation at country level.

Management response:

The principles of capacity development touch upon three main areas: promoting national ownership, promoting holistic and integrated approaches, and learning and measurement of transformation. Some flexibility in policy and procedure is needed if these principles are to apply in the diverse development settings where UNDP contributes. Such steps are being taken. Appropriate changes will be made to the way UNDP approaches programme and project management policies and procedures so that the modalities themselves are better suited to application in diverse operating environments. The learning function will be strengthened. Similarly, the capture of transformative results related to national capacities will be emphasized.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking[1]	
			Comments	Status
1.1 Review UNDP's approach to programme and project management, with a view to improving the organization's support to nationally led and owned systems and processes	June 2011	Bureau for Development Policy and Operations Support Group, with regional bureaux		
1.2 Strengthen support, appraisal and assurance throughout the country programme cycle to ensure capacity development features appropriately in UNDAFs and country programming	Ongoing and annually for remainder of strategic plan period	Regional support centres/regional bureaux		
1.3 Revise evaluation methodology and guidance to capture and reflect more consistently UNDP's capacity development contribution to national results	December 2011	Evaluation Office		
1.4 Review results-based management system to promote stronger tracking and capture of capacity development results	July 2011	Bureau for Development Policy with Operations Support Group		

Evaluation recommendation 2. Capacity development guidance should be drafted to maximize its coherence with government processes.

Guidelines will only be effective if staff understand why they are important for the work they do and for the requests of government and other partners. Guidance must therefore be drafted to respond to this reality and its value in government processes, where capacity development is rarely addressed as a discrete issue. UNDP should also ensure that future guidance helps staff distinguish clearly between capacity development and support that contributes to

[1] Status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database.

ongoing national activities. This would directly address the belief of many in the organization that they already address capacity development and therefore don't need to consider changes in how they work.

Management response: Where the capacity development methodology has been applied over the past few years, in around 60 countries, governments have given positive feedback about the approach and its coherence with national processes. Keeping pace with demand is now the major challenge. The work on national implementation capacities through national systems development and on national aid effectiveness systems also exhibits the successes to date. Current work at the level of UNDAFs and country programmes is intended to make the improvements needed in pre-positioning appropriate guidance and support for national partners. UNDP will redouble its efforts to improve the simplicity and utility of its resources.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
2.1 Simplify existing guidance to more appropriately align with national systems and processes	End 2011	Bureau for Development Policy		
2.2 Build on existing experiences of Southern networks to intensify peer learning about national and sector strategies, aid effectiveness and national implementation capacities	End 2011	Bureau for Development Policy and regional support centres		

Evaluation recommendation 3. UNDP should systematically assess good practices and develop knowledge of why these have happened.

Governments face increasingly complex national capacity challenges, while the limitations of traditional 'planned' approaches to capacity development are becoming more evident. These trends call for continuous learning. They present clear opportunities for both governments and UNDP to identify why capacity development has succeeded and the implications for replication. This should become UNDP's priority for work in support of capacity development. It will require dedicated resources. It will also require development of new approaches for learning lessons beyond those provided by traditional monitoring and evaluation systems, which focus on end results. Finally, it calls for enhancing knowledge management across units, regions and country offices to ensure dissemination of good practices and lessons.

Management response: While evidence from experience has been the standard for developing guidance on capacity development, UNDP recognizes the need to understand better the dynamics of change not only within governments and national domains but also within UNDP. Dedicated resources are needed for this work, which also needs to be integrated throughout the new UNDP knowledge management system. The publication series 'Stories of Institutions', introduced in 2010, will further focus on documenting lessons learned about how best practice has evolved in the maturation of institutions and on UNDP's gradual withdrawal from certain support functions. Similar initiatives will be launched to capture transformation and leave behind sustainable capacities. Common methods will be promoted for use across the organization and with national partners to learn from good practices and the factors of success.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
3.1 Develop in-house capacity to analyze factors of success in addressing complex capacity challenges and to share lessons	End 2011	Regional Support Centres, country offices and Bureau for Development Policy		
3.2 Increase effort to engage with national counterparts to document and report on lessons learned and why success arises in capacity development applications as perceived by national stakeholders.	Mid-2011 and inclusion in annual reporting	Bureau for Development Policy		
3.3 Invest in and sustain series on 'Stories of Institutions', including throughout UNDP units and national partners, using common	January 2011 to end of strategic plan period	Bureau for Development Policy		

methodology. Explore other streams of similar documentation				

Evaluation recommendation 4. UNDP should develop the capacities and competencies of its staff and managers in country offices to identify opportunities to integrate capacity development into their programme and projects.

Capacity development cannot be reduced to a blueprint or checklist of necessary actions. It requires acknowledging that UNDP works in environments in which outcomes and objectives are often ill-defined, consequences unpredictable, options limited and failure a cost of doing business. It therefore calls for placing a premium on informed judgment, which is difficult to track under an organization's management information systems. Required competencies also include flexibility, business orientation in exploiting situations and the drive and perseverance to get things done with governments. It also means not being prescriptive about process in order to avoid the danger of reinforcing rigid and formulaic approaches.

UNDP therefore needs to ensure that its internal reporting and management systems recognize this changed orientation. Country offices and regional bureaux have started developing diverse approaches to accessing the expertise needed to bring in experience from elsewhere and to develop specific plans of action with national partners based on lessons learned. This experience should be assessed to identify approaches that should be implemented more widely across the organization.

Management response: This recommendation gets to the very heart of the UNDP operating model. It speaks to the need for quality leadership at country level ('informed judgment'), the quality of staff ('competencies'), the need for responsiveness on the ground ('flexibility') and an entrepreneurial outlook to seize upon opportunities ('business orientation'). UNDP is committed to continuing to be responsive and flexible while also integrating capacity development more systematically into its work. The strengthening of the learning function, simplification of guidance and capture of transformative results initiatives detailed above serve to strengthen this response. It also involves continued investment in orienting staff on what it means to be a capacity development organization and how this should be reflected in programmatic interventions. This was done last in 2007 and was shown to have very useful impact. The recently produced 'Capacity Development Primer' has been well received by national partners. In combination, these point to the need to also extend capacity development learning to counterparts in government so there is a shared understanding of capacity development actions and the alignment of actions towards that end.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
4.1 Ensure capacity development learning and strategic orientation are integrated into relevant learning platforms for all managers and staff	2011 and 2012	Bureau for Development Policy and Bureau of Management		
4.2 Formulate and include capacity development competencies in human resource systems and job profiles, and highlight their importance in performance assessment	From mid-2011	Bureau for Development Policy and Bureau of Management		

Evaluation recommendation 5. UNDP should ensure that capacity development at the regional and headquarters level is not treated as a practice area.

UNDP should retain its internal expertise in capacity development at headquarters and regional levels. This expertise is a comparative advantage, and it is essential if the organization is to enhance its effectiveness as a global partner in capacity development and learn from examples of good practice. Making the change required by the guidance necessitates firm integration of capacity development into the work of the practices and the broader advisory cadre at regional level. This is also likely to decrease the proliferation of centrally produced guidance that uses different terminology and frameworks to address the same basic issues, and hence should reduce confusion for those who use the guidance. This approach will ensure that capacity development is properly addressed in UNDP's ongoing engagement with governments. It will enable UNDP to build on its strengths and past work to more effectively develop national capacities to achieve human development.

Management response: UNDP agrees with the finding that it should retain the present expertise in capacity development at headquarters and regional levels. UNDP further agrees that mainstreaming is the priority, and a strong custodial function is expected to decrease any proliferation of guidance or confusion over the capacity development approach being promoted by UNDP. At the regional level, capacity development services are already made available to countries (via country offices) for advocacy, policy and planning, as well as programming and project design. This may be further complemented through orientation of country-based advisors/specialists to identify and convey the opportunities in the programme and project cycle through which UNDP extends support to countries. Capacity development dialogue will be undertaken at regional and country levels to develop a shared understanding of where the opportunities lie for making transformative change, and therefore where resources are placed for leveraging such transformation. The TRAC2 allocation process will be reviewed to strengthen capacity development support to national partners through country programmes. To realize these ambitions, UNDP will establish a senior management review arrangement to ensure the capacity development agenda is mainstreamed, as was done for gender.

Capacity development is not treated as a practice area in UNDP, but rather as a cross-cutting feature of its work. As with gender, empirical evidence suggests that mainstreaming requires dedicated hubs of technical expertise, quality assurance and support.

Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
5.1 Continue mainstreaming of capacity development through programming arrangements, incentives, results capture and clarity of staff expectations	June 2011	Country offices, regional bureaux and Bureau for Development Policy		
5.2 Ensure sustainable financing arrangements to maintain critical capacities for the required capacity development functions in UNDP	January 2011 to end of strategic plan period	Bureau of Management and Bureau for Development Policy		
5.3 Institute senior management arrangements for mainstreaming capacity development, as was done for gender	January 2011	Bureau for Development Policy and Executive Office		